

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

SEP 3 '92

2 SEP 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

IN REPLY REFER TO:

Stop Code 1600A2
IC-92-09156
9202406

ORIGINAL
FILE

Honorable Larry E. Craig
United States Senate
302 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Craig:

Thank you for your letter on behalf of Mr. Lewis Pratt, President of the Idaho Sheriffs' Association in Boise, Idaho, regarding the Commission's billed party preference proposal. Billed party preference is the term used to describe a proposal to change the way local telephone companies handle certain operator service calls. Mr. Lewis opposes the proposal because, among other things, billed party preference would eliminate the arrangements which give correctional facilities the ability to choose a primary operator service provider.

Currently, if a caller places a "0+" operator services call (that is, the caller dials "0" and then a long-distance telephone number, without first dialing a carrier access code, such as 10-ATT), the call is carried by the operator services provider presubscribed to the telephone line from which the call originated. The presubscribed carrier for public payphones is chosen by the payphone owner or the owner of the premises on which the payphone is located. Operator service providers compete for payphone presubscription contracts by offering significant commissions to premises owners on long-distance traffic and then including those commission costs in their own rates to consumers.

In April 1992, the Commission adopted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to consider whether the current presubscription system should be replaced by a billed party preference methodology. Under billed party preference, all 0+ calls would be handled automatically by the carrier predesignated by the party paying for the call. For example, a credit card call would be handled by the carrier that issued the card. A collect call would be handled by the carrier presubscribed to the called line.

Because billed party preference would replace the current presubscription system for operator services calls, operator service providers would no longer be likely to pay significant commissions to premises owners for presubscription contracts. In addition, billed party preference could make

operator services much more user friendly for the calling public. In particular, it would allow callers to place their operator services calls without dialing access codes, while ensuring that the party paying for each call -- as opposed to the payphone or premises owner -- would determine the operator service provider to carry it.

Because of these and other benefits that potentially could be offered by billed party preference, the Commission tentatively concluded in its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that billed party preference is, in concept, in the public interest. At the same time, the Commission sought detailed information and comment on a comprehensive range of issues relating to this proposal.

The Commission has received extensive comment on the billed party preference proposal. Let me assure you that the Commission will carefully consider all of the ramifications of this important proposal, including the impact on correctional facilities, before taking final action on it. We will incorporate your letter and the letter from your constituent in the record of this proceeding so that they may be accorded proper consideration by Commission staff.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Cheryl A. Tritt", is written over a faint, circular official stamp.

Cheryl A. Tritt
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau

LARRY E. CRAIG
IDAHO
HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
(202) 224-2752

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-1203

AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION
AND FORESTRY
ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES
SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON AGING

CCB
92-77
2406

August 9, 1992

Jim Spurlock
Common Carrier Division
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
SEP 4 1992
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
92000130

Dear Mr. Spurlock:

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter and newspaper article sent to me by a group of constituents, the Idaho Sheriff's Association.

You will note that the group is concerned about the effect of the proposed Billed Party Preference regulations on prisons. I would appreciate your review and response to these concerns. Please address your response to:

Senator Larry Craig
Hart Senate Office Building Room 302
Washington, D.C. 20510
Attn: Angie Schaer

RECEIVED
AUG 24 3 07 PM '92
U.S. SENATE
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,



Larry E. Craig
United States Senate

Enclosure

LEC:ads

IDAHO SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

Box 1623
Boise, Idaho 83701
345-9126



July 20, 1992

Honorable Larry Craig
U. S. Senator
302 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Craig:

It has been brought to the attention of the Idaho Sheriffs Association that the Billed Party Preference Program (BPP) (Docket No. 92-77) would break down any arrangements that had been made which gave the ability to choose a primary operator service provider. This also removes the potential for commissions and thereby a loss of revenue to local governments. The Idaho Sheriffs Association is strongly opposed to this proposal.

With increased telephone fraud and the removal of number block, number searches and operator assistance, it would not be feasible for small counties to install inmate phones. This inmate screening is important, especially in small counties. Idaho is a rural state with small independent phone companies, all of which do not offer specialized services. This would mean that inmates would have to be moved once-a-day to a phone booth to make or receive phone calls. There could be potential problems by moving these prisoners including escape or injury. Sheriffs's departments would have to add additional staff which would increase budgets. In Idaho, this would mean that another office or mandated function would have to suffer. These are some of the reasons that counties have been or are looking at installing inmate phones.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns on this issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lewis E. Pratt".

Lewis Pratt, President
Idaho Sheriffs Association